



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE ANTI-UNION.

PRICE 2D.

TUESDAY, MARCH 5, 1799.

No. XXX.

TO THE
EDITORS OF THE ANTI-UNION.

GENTLEMEN,

THE duplicity of the minister and the fallacy of ministerial arguments for an Union become every day more manifest. Time brings falsehood as well as truth to light, and perhaps detects political sophistry with more effect than the most acute sagacity. Generally, however, the operation of time in the detection of falsehood is slow, and its effects perceptible only after long intervals; but either from the shallowness of the minister's artifice, or from the remarkable promineney of truth on this great question, he has been able to sink it but just below the surface—it has accordingly emerged into full view when the force which depressed it was removed: and, what has seldom been witnessed in the history of our legislature, the very same session in which a momentous measure was urged as of vital and indispensable necessity, has seen the duplicity of the propounder of that measure, and the arguments by which it was supported, exposed and refuted by subsequent events.

To be explicit—I boldly and in terms charge the young man, to whom the administration of this country is committed, with having falsified his own professions, with having refuted his own arguments for a legislative union, and with having involuntarily proved to the people of Ireland, that the measure which he attempted to steal upon the country, and which he is now preparing to propose again to its legislature, has been adopted by that deputy minister, and his master, with other views than those they have avowed, namely, the strengthening of the connexion between the two countries, the restoration of tranquillity, the advancement of civilization, and the improvement of the constitution of this country. I shall prove this charge in a very simple and I conceive a very satisfactory way, by comparing the doctrines which he inculcated in recommending a legislative Union with the measures which he has carried, and the conduct which he has held since the rejection of that project.

It cannot yet be forgotten even by the young man himself, and certainly not by the public, that the principal argument by which he endeavoured to support an Union, was the uncertainty of the bond which at present unites the two countries. In illustration of the danger which was supposed to exist from this cause one instance only could be found, and it was tri-

umphantly dwelt on as a proof that a situation might again occur, as it had already occurred, in which the exercise of complete legislative independence by the Irish parliament might tend to a separation of the two countries—That instance was the regency question. If the Irish parliament, it was said, continues to be a separate and independent legislature, it will always possess a right to differ from the British legislature in the appointment of a regent; and if it should differ from it in that instance there would be a temporary separation, leading perhaps to a perpetual separation of the executives of the two countries. To obviate this danger the young Lord proposed a surrender of the distinct independence of the Irish legislature, not in that case only—the only practical case which had ever occurred—but a total surrender of its distinct existence. Now if the young Lord did seriously believe that a danger of separation was connected with the exercise of distinct independence by the Irish parliament in this instance, he would be zealous to support a measure which went directly to remove that danger for ever by surrendering the right to that exercise; and if his fears of that danger were so gigantic as to incline him to obviate it by a total abolition of a distinct Irish legislature, he must be so much the more zealous to support a measure which went to effect the safety of the connexion by a less dangerous sacrifice. Has the young Lord acted on this principle? The dismissed Prime Serjeant, willing to prove himself as faithful a friend as the young Lord to the unity of the empire, though a much more steady friend to the independence of his country, brings in a bill by which the question of right to appoint a regent different, or under a different limitation, from that appointed by the British parliament, would be put at rest for ever, and the safety of the connexion in this particular rendered consistent with the distinct existence of Irish parliament. Does the young Lord relish this measure of honest loyalty to connexion and constitution? In the first instance, he assents in full silence to its introduction, and not having ingenuity enough to suggest any thing in derogation of the measure when first proposed, he avails himself of the time given by the forms of parliament in order to create objections to the measure itself, to cavil with the motives which suggested it, or the effects which it would produce. And what are the objections which he has fabricated or gleaned from his followers? They amount virtually to this—that it is a violent encroachment on the legislative independence of the country—that it is of infinite delicacy, intricacy, and importance—that it requires therefore much time and attention to mold properly—and above all, that the difficulty of its arrangement proves incontrovertibly the hazard-

ous state in which the connexion stands. Now, let the good people of Ireland consider what confidence they can place in the integrity of that man, who has the boldness to press them, at one time to give up their liberty and independence for the attainment of a particular purpose, and when that purpose is proposed to be attained at a less price, objects to the measure that it violates their independence! I ask the people, does not this conduct belie the motives of that man who urged a surrender of the constitution in order to prevent separation, and who, when separation is to be prevented in another way, objects to the constitution? What will they think of the honesty, or the sincerity, of him who would allow the legislature but twenty four hours to deliberate and decide upon a measure vesting the executive with absolute and irresponsible power, * but whose scrupulous delicacy and slow intellect requires an extraordinary time to deliberate on the question, whether the legislature, to perpetuate the connexion, should restrain the exercise of their free choice in a case of the most rare occurrence? Nay, what will they think of the understanding of the man who, when the legislature, foreseeing a remote danger from the possibility of a case in which a free exercise of their independence might tend to separation, propose to restrain the exercise of their right in that instance for the future, declares, that on this occasion he is more than ever convinced the independence of that legislature endangers the connexion, and that therefore they ought, as soon as possible, to surrender it altogether? For my part, I profess I can see in the conduct of such a man nothing but a thorough contempt for consistency, a palpable contradiction of former professions, an inveterate hostility to the independence of the country for reasons which he dares not avow, and a stolidity which incapacitates him from giving even colour and plausibility to his own actions.

But is this the only instance in which the young Lord has, in the course of three weeks, falsified his own professions, and refuted his own arguments? The young Lord, with the rashness rather than with the candour of a young man, told the people of Ireland that they had not the British constitution, but that an Union would give it to them. Now, either those measures which his lordship has promoted since the rejection of an Union were made necessary by the circumstances of the country, or they have been adopted by his lordship to punish this befuddled country for their rejection of this proffered boon. If the circumstances of the country made those measures necessary, they would have been adopted as well had an Union taken place as in case of its rejection; for the mere enactment of an Union could not immediately, if it could ever, produce any effect in rendering those measures less necessary. But what have these measures been? The most distasteful

ed is the rebellion bill, by which the executive power is authorized by law to suspend the operations of the civil courts, and exercise the indefinite and tremendous powers of martial-law at their mere discretion, and without controul. This then is the constitution of England, with which, after an Union we were to be blessed, This is one of the tranquillising, civilising, humanizing schemes, which an Union was to introduce; and it was thus that the people of Ireland were to be admitted within the pale of the constitution! But I will be told that it is unfair to attribute to his lordship an intention of carrying this measure had an Union been adopted, because it is now carried after the rejection of an Union. I reply, there is nothing unfair in charging him with that intention, if it cannot be shewn (and I defy any man to shew it) that circumstances have been rendered so different by the rejection of that measure that this bill is more necessary now than it would have been had the minister succeeded in his attempt at subjugating the country. There is certainly no shade of difference created by that rejection, and therefore there cannot be a doubt entertained by any rational man that his lordship would have proposed this bill had the country suffered itself to be duped into a surrender of its independence in the false hope of being admitted to a fuller participation of the benefits of the British Constitution, as well as in the present circumstances of the country. But what indignation would not the People of Ireland have justly entertained against the man, who should have substituted this dreadful law for a fuller enjoyment of constitutional liberty? Would they not have truly thought that his promise had been broken, and his professions falsified? And if this Bill was in his Lordship's contemplation when he was holding out to Ireland the deceitful hope of a full enjoyment of the privileges of the British Constitution; I ask is he not now fairly chargeable with having spoken falsely, and acted deceitfully, towards this country? Should I adopt the other alternative, and suppose that this measure was not necessary, either before or since the discussion of an Union, but that he has resorted to it as a measure of revenge, to punish our obliquity, or of experiment, to goad us to an Union, his Lordship's character, or that of the administration he leads, will not be much served by the supposition. In the one case, he will be guilty of deceit and falsehood; in the other, of fraud and malice. It is, however, with this latter that I am inclined to charge him, for that there was any thing in the circumstances of the country, or in the government, which made the adoption of this bill necessary, I cannot conceive. His Lordship has acknowledged it gives no new powers to administration, and therefore it could not be necessary to enable them to repress what he calls the rebellion. He has said, that the Government have already the undoubted right of trying and punishing rebellion in a summary way by law-martial, and that therefore, the only object of the bill is to prevent the

* Vide the debate on the Bill for suppressing the Rebellion, which invests the Irish Executive with power to establish law-martial, paramount to the civil power, over all the king's subjects.

civil power from interfering with the executive in the exercise of their right. Now taking for granted that, as his Lordship asserts, the executive have a *right* to try by martial law those who are found in rebellion, it must follow, that the civil power has no *right* to interfere with them, in the exercise of that right; for there cannot be two contradictory rights in those two powers.—But if the bill be not necessary either to strengthen the arm of the executive, or to secure to them the exclusive exercise of a right, which, if they possess at all, they must possess exclusively, from the very nature of the thing; I say the bill must then be adopted by the minister for the purpose I attribute to him—that of goading Ireland to an Union, by really depriving her of the benefits of the British Constitution, and by substituting for that constitution, an uncontrollable and indefinite power in the executive government. If it be asked, how it can at once be true, that it vests an indefinite and uncontrollable power in the executive government, and yet does not strengthen that executive? The answer is short: It does not strengthen the executive, because the powers which this bill gives they already possess by the *practice*, though not by the *theory* of the constitution; powers which the government in times of danger and rebellion have always exercised, but under a responsibility to the legislature for this violation of constitutional forms. But this bill does that which, in times of the greatest turbulence, in times of rebellion and under the most arbitrary reigns, no minister ever dared to propose to the legislature; it establishes despotism by law, and abolishes the constitution by act of Parliament; it sanctions *a priori*, by a statute, that power, which, under the British Constitution, it has sometimes been necessary for the executive to exercise, but for the exercise of which, the executive has been always left to justify itself afterwards, by the circumstances which made it necessary, and the temperance with which it was accompanied. Here then the check on despotism is removed; for by this bill the power is *legally* vested in the executive, and for the exercise of a legal power there is no responsibility. Such is the law by which the minister has made the second assault upon the constitution of Ireland, and which I venture to predict, is the forerunner of a total subversion of constitutional liberty in the British Empire!

I have mentioned one measure which his Lordship has virtually opposed since the rejection of an Union, tho' he had previously declared its necessity and its importance; and I have adverted to another which he has introduced, that tends to destroy the constitution, and therefore falsifies his profession, that he wished to procure for Ireland a fuller participation of British Liberty. There remain other monuments of insincerity, of fraud, and of hostility to Ireland. What shall we say of his silence on those measures which, not two months since, we were told by him were indispensable to the contentment of the people, and the restoration of confidence and peace to Ireland? I speak of the substitution

for tythes, and the arrangements in favour of the Catholic clergy: But it were superfluous to expatiate upon these topics; it must be apparent to every man of common sense, either that the minister talked of those measures, pending the discussion of an Union, purely to cajole the public, or that he now with-holds those measures from some motive of crooked policy which looks to other objects than the good of Ireland; for who can doubt that if these measures would be useful with an Union, they would be also useful without it? Who can doubt whether they would not remove one of the great causes of insubordination in Ireland, and abolish one of the most fertile sources of religious jealousy? The minister himself has acknowledged the principle, and therefore he stands convicted either of having declared to the people of Ireland as his opinion, that which he did not believe, or of wickedly with-holding from the country, from the worst motives, the means of restoring to it, content and tranquillity.

A FABLE,

BY

NURSE DANDLUM,

TO AMUSE THE CHILDREN OF DUBLIN.

IN a wide forest once there lived
A Lion of great power;
Who in the science of attack,
Had practis'd many an hour.

Nay, if two neighb'ring beasts did wage
A fair and open strife,
The meddling beast would step between,
And try for either life.

This Lion had an useful friend,
A young courageous whelp,
Who often from the neighb'ring cave,
Stept out to give him help.

The creature was a Jackall named,
By some miscall'd a slave;
But, children, don't believe the lie,
For he was free and brave.

What tho' the Lion had more bulk,
Could sooner crush and kill;
Full often he had gain'd a prize
By little Jacky's skill.